

REMARKS

I. Examiner Interview

Applicants' attorneys appreciate the Examiner's courtesy in speaking with them on September 20, 2007, regarding the outstanding office action. The interview included discussion of the §102 and §103 rejections. Applicants submit that the comments below reflect the substance of the interview.

II. Status

Claims 1, 5, 13, 25, 30, 41, 50, 56, and 62 have been amended. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the specification. Claims 7 and 19 have been previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-67 are currently pending.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 – Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 11, 13-16, 20, 23, 25, 30-33, 35-36, 39, 41-43, 45, 50-52, 56, and 62-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Callway, et al. (U.S. 6,279,067).

Claim 1 and Dependents

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "wherein any one of the plurality of embedded devices is operable to be the controlling device when given the permission to transmit on the communications link." Callway, et al. does not teach or suggest at least these features.

Callway, et al. discloses techniques to determine interrupt requests between a video interface port ("VIP") host and VIP slaves. (Callway, et al., columns 3 and 4). The VIP host reads a shared interrupt request flag of one of the slave devices to determine if an interrupt request is pending. (Callway, et al., column 4, lines 9-11). The VIP host and the VIP slaves communicate via a VIP bus 20. (Callway, et al., column 3, lines 4-5). However, none of these passages disclose the claimed features. First, column 1, lines 36-38 of Callway, et al. disclose that the interrupt request is used to notify the host that attention is required, not that the interrupt request is for requesting permission to transmit on the VIP bus 20. Second, there is no teaching or suggestion that anyone of the VIP slaves can become the VIP host when a VIP slave is given permission to transmit on the VIP bus. The VIP host is

the controlling device that receives the interrupt signal and always remains the controlling device. Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion that any one of a plurality of embedded devices is operable to be a controlling device when given the permission to transmit on a communications link.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 2-6, 8-12, and 28 depend, directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1 and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

One or more of the dependent claims recite features that are independently allowable. For example, claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the confirmation signal is asserted by activating a wait pin, the wait pin being for data flow control, wherein activation of the wait pin indicates a stop of data acceptance." Callway, et al. discloses interrupt request pins 32 and 42 as well as interrupt request flags 38 and 48. (Callway, et al., Figure 2). However, the request pins and flags are not wait pins that can be activated to indicate the stop of acceptance of data flow. The interrupt request pins and flags of Callway are used merely to assert an interrupt request. There is no teaching or suggestion of features associated with a wait pin. Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 13, 25, 30, 41, 50, 56, and 62 and Dependents

Claims 13, 25, 30, 41, 50, 56, and 62 have been amended to recite features substantially similar to the features of claim 1 described above. The arguments made in regards to claim 1 appropriately apply to claims 13, 25, 30, 41, 50, 56, and 62 as well.

Accordingly, claims 13, 25, 30, 41, 50, 56, and 62 are allowable for at least those reasons. Claims 14-18, 20-24, 29, 26-27, 31-40, 42-49, 51-55, 57-61, and 63-67 depend, directly or indirectly, from allowable claims 13, 25, 30, 41, 50, 56, and 62, respectively, and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 21, 22, 27-29, 34, 37, 38, 44, and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Callway, et al.

Claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 21, 22, 27-29, 34, 37, 38, 44, and 61 depend, directly or indirectly, from respective allowable claims and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 21, 22, 27-29, 34, 37, 38, 44, and 61 based on Official Notice. (Office Action, pages 5-6). MPEP § 2144.03 allows an Examiner to take Official Notice to rely on common knowledge, but only in *limited* circumstances. Just because something is known, it does not mean that it becomes obvious to combine with any reference. For example, regarding claims 4, 17, 27, 34, 44, and 61, just because a round-robin method is known, it does not mean that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a round-robin method for determining which one of a plurality of embedded devices requested permission to transmit on a communications link. All of the limitations of the claims have not been taught or suggested. Accordingly, claims 4, 9, 10, 17, 21, 22, 27-29, 34, 37, 38, 44, and 61 are allowable for at least this reason.

Regarding claims 9, 21, and 37, just because a general purpose processor is known, it does not mean that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a general purpose processor with the teachings of Callway, et al. Callway, et al. discloses a VIP host and VIP slaves. It would not make sense to modify the VIP host or the VIP slaves to be a general purpose processor. All of the limitations of the claims have not been taught or suggested. Accordingly, claims 9, 21, and 37 are allowable for at least this reason.

Regarding claims 10, 22, and 38, just because a radio telephone is known, it does not mean that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to place the teachings of Callway, et al. in a radio telephone. Actually, column 1, lines 13-14 disclose that the VIP host and slave features would be part of a DVD player or television display, not a radio telephone. All of the limitations of the claims have not been taught or suggested. Accordingly, claims 10, 22, and 38 are allowable for at least this reason.

Regarding claim 29, just because a CDMA processor is known, it does not mean that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a CDMA processor with the teachings of Callway, et al. Callway, et al. discloses a VIP host and VIP slaves. It would not make sense to modify the VIP host or the VIP slaves to be a CDMA processor because the CDMA processor is used for telecommunication processing and is not under the VIP standard. All of the limitations of the claims have not been taught or suggested. Accordingly, claim 29 is allowable for at least this reason.

B. Claims 6, 12, 18, 24, 26, 35, 40, 46-49, 53-55, 57-60, and 65-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Callway, et al. in view of Iwata, et al. (U.S. 7,058,741).


Claims 6, 12, 18, 24, 26, 35, 40, 46-49, 53-55, 57-60, and 65-67 depend, directly or indirectly, from respective allowable claims and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above.

One or more of the dependent claims recite features that are independently allowable. For example, claims 49, 55, 60, and 67 recite, *inter alia*, the ability to exclusively transmit data on the communications link or means. None of the cited references disclose this feature. Iwata, et al. discloses a host device and slave electronic devices that request permission to transmit on a data line 508. (Iwata, et al., column 17, lines 12-52). The host device controls the data line and determines which slave electronic device can communicate with the host device via the data line 508. Also, none of the slave electronic devices are operable to be the host device. Callway, et al. also has a host and slave configuration. However, the references do not teach or suggest exclusive transmission of data on a data line or communications link. In either reference, a host device *and* at least one slave device are operable to communicate back and forth with each other on the data or communications link. There is no showing that *only one* device transmits on a data or communications link while the others cannot until given permission. Accordingly, claims 49, 55, 60, and 67 are allowable for at least this reason.

V. Summary

It is respectfully asserted that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references, and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Adil M. Musabji", is positioned above a horizontal line.

Adil M. Musabji
Reg. No. 58,728
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200